

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 05852 01 OF 02 221421Z

65

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 104438

P 221313Z JUL 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3149

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 SALT TWO GENEVA 5852

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: DRAFT NAC STATEMENT FOR JULY 29 CONSULTATION

(SALT TWO - 1072)

REF: SALT TWO GENEVA 5359 (SALT TWO -1054); STATE 174009

1. FOLLOWING IS DRAFT TEXT OF PROPOSED STATEMENT TO NAC FOR
MY JULY 29 CONSULTATION THHERE. REQUEST WASHINGTON CONCURRENCE
AND/OR COMMENTS:

2 BEGIN TEXT

DRAFT STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL, JULY 29, 1976

1. I AM PLEASED AGAIN TO MEET WITH YOU TO CONTINUE OUR REGULAR
CONSULTATIONS ON THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS. SINCE MY
LAST VISIT HERE ON APRIL 15 THERE HAS BEEN A NUMBER OF DEVELOP-
MENTS IN GENEVA WHICH I WANT TO DISCUSS WITH YOU. IMMEDIATELY

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 05852 01 OF 02 221421Z

FOLLOWING THIS MEETING, THERE WILL BE AN EXPERT'S MEETING AT

WHICH THE UNITED STATES WILL BE REPRESENTED BY MR. RALPH EARLE OF THE SALT DELEGATION.

2. AS I REPORTED DURING OUR LAST MEETING, NEGOTIATIONS BEGAN THIS YEAR IN GENEVA ON JANUARY 28 AND, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF A SHORT WORKING RECESS, THE DELEGATIONS HAVE BEEN MEETING CONTINUOUSLY SINCE THAT TIME. THE DELEGATIONS RECENTLY AGREED TO A RECESS BEGINNING ON JULY 30 WITH NEGOTIATIONS TO RESUME ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21.

3. DURING MY LAST MEETING WITH YOU, I INDICATED THAT SOME OUTSTANDING ISSUES, IN PARTICULAR BACKFIRE AND CRUISE MISSILES, ARE BEING DISCUSSED DIRECTLY BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND MOSCOW. THIS IS STILL THE CASE TODAY, AND THEREFORE, I WILL DIRECT MY REMARKS TO THOSE ISSUES BEING DISCUSSED IN GENEVA.

4. IN GENEVA THE DELEGATIONS HAVE CONTINUED THE PRACTICE OF WEEKLY PLENARY SESSIONS BUT THE NUMBER OF PRIVATE MEETINGS BETWEEN THE CHIEFS OF DELEGATIONS HAS INCREASED. IN ADDITION TO THE TWO REGULAR MEETINGS A WEEK OF THE DRAFTING WORKING GROUP, THERE HAVE BEEN NUMEROUS INFORMAL MEETINGS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE TWO DELEGATIONS. THE WORK OF THE DELEGATIONS HAS CONCENTRATED ON THE DEFINITION OF ARMS TO BE LIMITED BY THE AGREEMENT, MIRV VERIFICATION, AND DATA BASE.

5. YOU WILL RECALL FROM OUR PREVIOUS MEETINGS THAT WE HAVE BEEN WORKING TOWARD A LIMIT ON THE LAUNCH-WEIGHT AND THROW-WEIGHT FOR BOTH HEAVY AND LIGHT ICBMS. BOTH SIDES HAVE AGREED IN EFFECT THAT LIGHT ICBMS WILL NOT HAVE A LAUNCH-WEIGHT OR THROW-WEIGHT GREATER THAN THE SOVIET SS-19, AND HEAVY ICBMS WILL NOT HAVE A LAUNCH-WEIGHT OR THROW-WEIGHT GREATER THAN THE SOVIET SS-9, AND SS-18, RESPECTIVELY.

6. IN THIS PROCESS, WE HAVE ALSO ARRIVED AT SUBSTANTIAL AGREEMENT ON THE DEFINITION OF THE TERM "THROW-WEIGHT". THERE ONLY REMAINS TO BE WORKED OUT A COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON THE MEANING OF ONE OF THE TERMS USED IN THE DEFINITION.

7. TO ACHIEVE AGREEMENT ON THESE ISSUES, THE US AGREED TO USE THE TERM "LIGHT" INSTEAD OF "NON-HEAVY" TO DESCRIBE ICBMS THAT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 05852 01 OF 02 221421Z

ARE NOT CLASSIFIED AS HEAVY ICBMS. HOWEVER, WE HAVE RESERVED THE RIGHT TO RETURN TO THE QUESTION OF MISSILE CLASSIFICATION DURING FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS.

8. WE HAVE CONTINUED TO WORK ON THE OTHER DEFINITIONS AS WELL. AS I MENTIONED AT THE LAST MEETING, THE SIDES ARE IN GENERAL AGREEMENT ON THE DEFINITION OF AN SLBM LAUNCHER. WHILE THE DELEGATIONS HAVE AGREED THAT IF A PARTICULAR LAUNCHER HAS

LAUNCHED AN ICBM, THEN THAT LAUNCHER IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ICBM LAUNCHER, THE DIFFERENCE ARISES OVER THE SOVIET UNWILLINGNESS TO AGREE THAT ALL OTHER LAUNCHERS OF THAT TYPE WILL ALSO BE CONSIDERED ICBM LAUNCHERS. HOWEVER, BOTH SIDES AGREED ON A BAN ON CONVERTING NON-ICBM LAUNCHERS TO LAUNCHERS OF ICBMS.

9. SINCE MY LAST MEETING WITH YOU BOTH SIDES HAVE TABLED REVISED PROPOSALS RELATIVE TO THEIR MIRV VERIFICATION POSITIONS. WHILE THE TWO SIDES HAVE REACHED AGREEMENT ON THE DEFINITION OF MIRVS, THE BASIC ISSUE REMAINS AS TO WHICH LAUNCHERS WILL BE COUNTED AS MIRV LAUNCHERS. THE US BELIEVES THAT ONCE A LAUNCHER OF A PARTICULAR TYPE HAS CONTAINED OR LAUNCHED A MIRVED MISSILE, ALL LAUNCHERS OF THAT TYPE MUST BE CONSIDERED TO BE MIRV LAUNCHERS. THIS APPROACH BEST ENABLES US TO VERIFY COMPLIANCE WITH THE 1320 MIRV LIMIT. THE SOVIETS BELIEVE THAT ONLY THOSE LAUNCHERS WHICH HAVE ACTUALLY CONTAINED A MIRVED MISSILE SHOULD BE COUNTED AS MIRV LAUNCHERS. ALSO, IN CONNECTION WITH MIRV VERIFICATION, THERE HAS BEEN CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION AS TO WHEN ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS BEING CONVERTED TO MIRV LAUNCHERS BEGIN TO COUNT IN THE MIRV AGGREGATE. BOTH SIDES AGREE THAT SLBM LAUNCHERS COUNT WHEN THE SUBMARINE IN WHICH SUCH LAUNCHERS ARE INSTALLED FIRST GOES TO SEA AFTER CONVERSION. HOWEVER, THE SIDES DISAGREE AS TO WHEN A FIXED ICBM LAUNCHER UNDERGOING CONVERSION TO MIRV STATUS BEGINS TO COUNT. THE US WOULD COUNT SUCH LAUNCHERS AS MIRVED AT A VERIFIABLE POINT IN TIME IN THE INITIAL STAGE OF CONVERSION; THE SOVIETS WOULD COUNT SUCH LAUNCHERS AS MIRV LAUNCHERS AFTER WHAT THEY CALL "COMPLETION OF CONVERSION", BY WHICH THEY APPARENTLY MEAN WHEN A MIRVED MISSILE HAS BEEN DEPLOYED IN THE LAUNCHER. ADDITIONALLY, THE SOVIETS HAVE PROPOSED THAT LAUNCHERS BEING CONVERTED FROM A MIRV TO A NON-MIRV STATUS CEASE TO COUNT IN THE MIRV AGGREGATE "WHEN CONVERSION BEINGS". WE BELIEVE THAT THE QUESTION OF REMOVING SYSTEMS FROM THE MIRV

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 05852 01 OF 02 221421Z

AGGREGATE SHOULD BE HANDLED BY THE STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION, AND THAT THIS MATTER IS ALREADY ADEQUATELY COVERED IN AN AGREED PROVISION PROVIDING THAT ARMS SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS OF THE AGREEMENT CONTINUE TO COUNT UNTIL THEY ARE DISMANTLED, ARE DESTROYED, OR OTHERWISE CEASE TO BE SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS UNDER PROCEDURES AGREED UPON IN THE STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 05852 02 OF 02 221430Z

65

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 104557

P 221313Z JUL 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3150

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 SALT TWO GENEVA 5852

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

10. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF BACKFIRE, THE SIDES ARE IN GENERAL AGREEMENT ON THE TYPES OF AIRCRAFT TO BE INCLUDED AS HEAVY BOMBERS. HOWEVER, THERE ARE STILL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SIDES ON THE ISSUE OF BOMBER VARIANTS (I.E., TANKER, ANTI-SUB-MARINE WARFARE, AND RECONNAISSANCE VERSIONS OF BEAR AND BISON). AS I EXPLAINED DURING OUR LAST MEETING, THE US POSITION IS THAT BOTH HEAVY BOMBERS AND HEAVY BOMBER VARIANTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE. THE BASIS FOR THE US POSITION IS THE DIFFICULTY IN DISCRIMINATING HEAVY BOMBERS FROM THESE VARIANTS AND OUR VIEW THAT AT LEAST SOME HEAVY BOMBER VARIANTS MAY BE QUICKLY CONVERTED TO THE HEAVY BOMBER ROLE. THE SOVIETS CONTEND THAT THE DIFFERENT CONFIGURATIONS CAN BE DISCRIMINATED BY NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS AND THAT NONE OF THEM CAN BE QUICKLY CONVERTED TO A HEAVY BOMBER ROLE. THEY HAVE SO FAR NOT ACCEPTED OUR SUGGESTION THAT THERE BE TECHNICAL TALKS IN AN EFFORT TO SORT OUT THE FACTS.

11. AT OUR LAST MEETING I DESCRIBED OUR DATA BASE PROPOSAL. WE HAVE CONTINUED TO PRESENT OUR RATIONALE FOR THIS PROPOSAL TO THE SOVIETS. YOU WILL RECALL THAT THIS PROVIDED THAT THE SIDES REACH ACCORD ON THE NUMBERS OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS IN EACH

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 05852 02 OF 02 221430Z

CATEGORY POSSESSED BY EACH SIDE AT THE TIME OF SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT. IF THIS PROPOSAL IS ACCEPTED, THE US WOULD

BE WILLING TO AGREE THAT THE REQUIRED DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION OF EXCESS SYSTEMS COULD BE COMPLETED WITHIN CERTAIN SPECIFIED PERIODS OF TIME AFTER EXPIRATION OF THE INTERIM AGREEMENT, AND TO DROP OUR PROPOSAL FOR PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES IN THE STATUS OF ARMS SUBJECT TO THE AGREEMENT. THE SOVIETS HAVE CONTINUED TO RESIST THIS PROPOSAL BUT, IN RESPONSE TO OUR CONTINUED INSISTENCE, THEY ARE NOT REFUSING TO DISCUSS THE ISSUE. AS I SAID LAST TIME, WE CONSIDERED THAT AN AGREED DATA BASE IS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO ASSURE THAT BOTH SIDES ARE APPLYING THE PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT IN A UNIFORM MANNER.

12. WITH RESPECT TO FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS, WE HAVE NOW REACHED AGREEMENT PROVIDING THAT AFTER ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THIS AGREEMENT, NEGOTIATIONS WILL BE UNDERTAKEN IN 1977, WITH THE OBJECTIVE OF ACHIEVING AGREEMENT, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE ON FURTHER MEASURES FOR THE LIMITATION AND REDUCTION OF STRATEGIC ARMS. WE HAVE ALSO AGREED ON THE OBJECTIVE OF CONCLUDING AN AGREEMENT TO REPLACE THIS AGREEMENT WELL IN ADVANCE OF 1985.

13. THERE HAS BEEN NO FURTHER DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE SIDES ON MOBILE ICBMS, WHICH ARE PERMITTED BY THE US VERSION OF THE JOINT DRAFT TEXT. WHILE THE SOVIET VERSION OF THE JDT WOULD BAN AIR-MOBILE ICBMS (EXCEPT ON HEAVY BOMBER), THEY HAVE NOT RAISED IN GENEVA THE SUBJECT OF LAND-MOBILE ICBMS.

14. DURING THIS SESSION THE SOVIETS HAVE CONTINUED TO RAISE THE ISSUE OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION AND NON-TRANSFER, AND WE HAVE CONTINUED TO REFUSE TO DISCUSS THESE ISSUES UNTIL OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE NEW AGREEMENT HAVE BEEN DETERMINED. AS I PREVIOUSLY INFORMED YOU, SHOULD WE DECIDE IT MAY BE DESIRABLE TO TABLE LANGUAGE ON EITHER NON-TRANSFER OR NON-CIRCUMVENTION, WE WOULD CONSULT WITH OUR ALLIES IN ADVANCE.

15. WITH RESPECT TO "FBS", THE SOVIETS HAVE REPEATED THEIR PROPOSAL THAT THE US PROVIDE A MULTILATERAL STATEMENT THAT THE US WILL NOT BUILD UP FBS, AND WILL ALSO UNDERTAKE TO REDUCE SUCH SYSTEMS. WE HAVE OF COURSE CONTINUED TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT WE DO NOT CONSIDER FBS AN APPROPRIATE SUBJECT FOR THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 05852 02 OF 02 221430Z

16. THIS CONCLUDES MY FORMAL PRESENTATION, AND I WILL BE GLAD TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE. END TEXT. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: TEXT, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), NEGOTIATIONS, MEETINGS, SPEECHES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 22 JUL 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: MartinML
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976SALTT05852
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760282-0416
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760732/aaaabbrr.tel
Line Count: 271
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 76 STATE 174009
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: MartinML
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10 MAY 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 MAY 2004 by buchant0>; APPROVED <01 SEP 2004 by MartinML>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFT NAC STATEMENT FOR JULY 29 CONSULTATION (SALT TWO - 1072)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR, (JOHNSON, U ALEXIS)
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006